

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 1. This sheet replaces the original sheet that included Figure 1. In Figure 1, previously omitted elements S1, S2, 11a, 11b, 12a and 12b have been added.

**REMARKS****I. Informal Matters**

In the Office Action dated August 24, 2004, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a), stating that certain features of the invention recited in the claims are not shown in the drawings. In response, Applicants respectfully amend Figure 1 by adding previously omitted elements S1, S2, 11a, 11b, 12a and 12b. The replacement sheet containing amended Figure 1 is provided herewith. The Applicants also amend the corresponding portions of the specification by adding the reference to the added drawing features. The aforesaid amendments to the drawings and specification do not constitute a new matter because all the added elements have been fully recited by the originally filed claims as well as the original specification.

The Examiner further objected to the specification because of certain informalities. Applicants submit an appropriate correction.

The Examiner additionally objected to claim 1 because of certain informal matters. Applicants submit an appropriate correction.

**II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-5 are pending in the subject application, of which claim 1 is currently amended. No new matter is introduced.

Claims 1-2 and 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Shieh (U.S. patent No. 6,122,175). In support of the aforesaid rejection, the Examiner states that Shieh teaches all the limitations recited in claims 1-2 and 4-5. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the Applicants' amendment to claim 1 and the following arguments.

Firstly, with respect to Examiner's rejection of claims 4 and 5, Applicants respectfully note that Shieh neither teaches nor suggests the claimed feature of the invention wherein the first or second size recited in the respective claims 4 and 5 is the size of an ExpressCard standard connector. Specifically, Shieh teaches a card for interfacing PCMCIA and Compact flash devices, see Shieh, Abstract. Applicants' thorough examination of Shieh revealed that Shieh never even mentions the recited

ExpressCard standard. In this regard Applicants note that the PCMCIA connector described by Shieh, also known in the art as Card Bus connector, is radically different from the claimed ExpressCard interface. When the PTO asserts that there is an explicit or implicit teaching or suggestion in the prior art, it must indicate where such teaching or suggestion appears in the reference. See In re Rijckaert, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955,7 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claims 4 and 5, are patentable over Shieh.

To emphasize the stated distinction of the present invention over Shieh, Applicants amend independent claim 1 by adding a limitation wherein at least one of the recited first and second interface protocols is an ExpressCard protocol. Because Shieh fails to teach or even suggest the ExpressCard protocol, Applicants believe that the amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Shieh and, therefore, is patentable.

Applicants further specifically traverse Examiner's rejections of claim 2, which is believed to be independently patentable. However, the rejection of claim 2, as well as the aforesaid ejections of claims 4 and 5 are believed to be moot in view of applicant's amendment of the parent claim 1.

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-2 and 4-5 are patentable over Shieh.

The Examiner further rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Georgopoulos et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,457,601). In support of the aforesaid rejection, the Examiner states that Georgopoulos teaches all the limitations recited in claims 1 and 3. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the Applicants' amendment to claim 1 and the following arguments.

Georgopoulos et al. discloses a PCMCIA modem card for interfacing a personal computer to a phone line. The disclosed card uses three connectors, including a PCMCIA connector 306, edge connector 344 (both shown in Fig. 3 of Georgopoulos et al.) and a 2-pin connector 122, shown in Fig. 2.

Like Shieh, Georgopoulos et al. also never mentions the ExpressCard standard connector. On the other hand, the amended claim 1 specifically recites a feature of the

present invention wherein at least one of the recited first and second interface protocols is an ExpressCard protocol. This claimed feature is neither taught nor suggested by Georgopoulos. For this reason, claim 1 and its dependent claim 3 are not anticipated by either Georgopoulos or Shieh, and, therefore, these claims are patentable over the cited art.

### III. Conclusion

For all the forgoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the pending claims are allowable. Therefore, prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds that the Application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Pavel Pogodin at (650) 954-6857.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time that may be required to keep this Application in prosecution.

Respectfully Submitted

/Dr. Pavel Pogodin/

Pavel Pogodin, Esq.

Reg. No. 48,205

Pavel Pogodin, Esq.  
TransPacific Law Group  
617 North Delaware Street  
San Mateo, California 94401  
(650) 954-6857  
(650) 342-4403 Fax  
e-mail: [pavel@transpacificlaw.com](mailto:pavel@transpacificlaw.com)

Date: December 27, 2004